

### **REMARKS**

This amendment is in response to the Final Office Action mailed June 20, 2006. Claims 1, 11, 12, 15, 16, 20, 24, 25, 28, 31, 34, 36, 38, and 39 have been amended. Claims 1-39 are presently pending. No new matter has been added.

#### **§102 and §103 Rejections**

Claims 1-33, 38 and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,557,028 to Cragun ("Cragun"). Claims 34-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cragun in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,898,762 to Ellis et al. ("Ellis"). The Applicant traverses these rejections.

Each of independent claims 1, 25, and 28 have been amended to recite that there are a plurality of access devices in a household. Cragun does not teach or suggest having a plurality of access devices in a household. Cragun further does not teach or suggest sharing/updating configuration information regarding user objects between the access devices of the household. None of the other cited references address this deficiency of Cragun. Accordingly, the cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest every element of independent claims 1, 25, and 28, as well as the claims which depend therefrom.

Each of independent claims 1, 11, 15, 20, 31, 34, 36, 38, and 39 have been amended to clarify that a user accesses a system by logging on to a user object. This definition is consistent with the present specification. (See, for example, p. 14, lines 4-19.) The Office Action has taken the position that the "user objects are interpreted to be the entries in the collaborative bookmark list" of Cragun. (Office Action, p. 3.) This interpretation in the Office Action is not consistent with the use of the term "user object" in the present patent application. The present amendment further clarifies the meaning of the term "user object."

Cragun does not teach or suggest a "user object" on to which the user logs to obtain access to a system. The entries in a bookmark list in Cragun do not allow a user to log on and obtain access to a system. Instead, in Cragun the user must log on to the system in order to use the

entries in the bookmark list. In other words, the bookmark list is only available after the user has logged on to a system. Accordingly, these bookmark list entries of Cragun are not “user objects” as understood in the present specification or recited in the present claims. None of the other cited references address these deficiencies of Cragun. Accordingly, the cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest every element of independent claims 1, 11, 15, 20, 31, 34, 36, 38, and 39, as well as the claims which depend therefrom.

Independent claims 25, 28, and 36, as well as dependent claims 6, 13, 14, 17, and 21, each recite a “ticket number.” Cragun does not teach or suggest a ticket number. The Office Action asserts that “Cragun teaches labeling configuration changes as nominate, approve and more [sic] records. How the configuration changes are labeled, whether numerically, alphabetically, or alphanumerically, is irrelevant.” (Office Action, p. 3.)

Each of the above-identified claims is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Cragun. To anticipate a claim, the cited reference must expressly or inherently teach each and every element of the claim. M.P.E.P. §2131. The Office Action appears to acknowledge that Cragun does not expressly or inherently teach a ticket number but asserts that how a configuration change is labeled is irrelevant. Given the lack of specific express or inherent teaching in Cragun of a ticket number, the above-identified claims cannot be rejected as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102. A claim element cannot be ignored as irrelevant if an anticipation rejection is to be maintained. If the rejection of these claims is to be maintained under 35 U.S.C. §102, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner specifically identify the teaching in Cragun that supports anticipation of the recited ticket number.

None of the other cited references address these deficiencies of Cragun. Accordingly, the cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest every element of independent claims 6, 13, 14, 17, 21, 25, 28, and 36, as well as the claims which depend therefrom.


For at least the reasons given above, each of the independent claims 1, 11, 15, 20, 25, 28, 31, 34, 36, 38, and 39, as well as the remaining claims which depend therefrom, are patentable over

the cited references. The Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of these claims.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If the Examiner has any questions or concerns, the Applicant encourages the Examiner to contact the Applicant's representative, Bruce Black, by telephone to discuss the matter.

Dated: September 20, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Bruce E. Black

Registration No.: 41,622  
DARBY & DARBY P.C.  
P.O. Box 5257  
New York, New York 10150-5257  
(206) 262-8900  
(212) 527-7701 (Fax)  
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant